```
MISTER PHILLIPS, SBN 228991
   LAW OFFICE OF MISTER PHILLIPS
   P.O. Box 1162
   Pinole, CA 94564
3
   Phone: (510) 672-3756
   Fax: (510) 222-4198
   mister_phillips@hotmail.com
5
   Attorney for Plaintiff Christian J. Bracko
6
   JAMES V. FITZGERALD, III, (State Bar No. 55632)
   NOAH G. BLECHMAN (State Bar No. 197167)
7
   MCNAMARA, DODGE, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY, PFALZER, BORGES &
   BROTHERS LLP
8
   1211 Newell Avenue
   Post Office Box 5288
   Walnut Creek, CA 94596
   Telephone: (925) 939-5330
10
   Facsimile: (925) 939-0203
11
   Attorneys for Defendants
   ALEX CAINE; CITY OF SAN PABLO
12
13
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14
                     NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15
                          SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
16
17
   CHRISTIAN J. BRACKO,
                                    ) Case No.: 3:08-cv-00239-JL
18
              Plaintiff,
                                     ) JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT
19
        vs.
20
   ALEX CAINE; CITY OF SAN PABLO,
21
   CA; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,
22
              Defendants.
23
24
        Jurisdiction and Service
25
        The court has original and supplemental jurisdiction over
26
   the case. No issues exist regarding personal jurisdiction or
   venue. All parties have been served.
27
28
```

2 3

1

4 5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

#### 2. Facts

On November 27, 2006, San Pablo Police Officer Brady made a traffic stop on the plaintiff. The plaintiff fled by car and then on foot. Police Officer Brady caught the plaintiff and grabbed him. The plaintiff tried to pull away from Police Officer Brady. Police Officer Brady wrestled the plaintiff down and onto his stomach.

The plaintiff claims he stopped resisting arrest; Police Officer Brady handcuffed him; and he laid peaceably on the Then San Pablo Police Officer Alex Caine ran from ground. around the corner and jumped on the plaintiff's head with his knee.

The defendants claim that Plaintiff violently struggled and fought with Officer Brady until Police Officer Caine was able to assist Officer Brady in controlling and handcuffing the resistive and violent Plaintiff. A significant amount of marijuana associated with Plaintiff was found following Plaintiff's arrest.

In subsequent criminal proceedings, the plaintiff pled guilty to resisting arrest in violation of Penal Code § 148(a)(1).

#### 3. Legal Issues

- Whether the Defendants' Violated Plaintiff's 4th Amendment Α. Rights.
- Whether the Plaintiff's Excessive Force Claim is Heck-Barred Because He Pled Guilty to Resisting Arrest.

The plaintiff's position is that his claim is not Heckbarred because Police Officer Caine used excessive force on him 1 after he stopped resisting arrest. Smith v. City of Hemet, 349 3 5 6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

17

16

19

18

20 21

22

23 24

> 25 26

27

28

F.3d 689, 696 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[E]xcessive force used after a defendant has been arrested may properly be the subject of a § 1983 action notwithstanding the defendant's conviction on a charge of resisting an arrest that was itself lawfully conducted.") Moreover, even if the plaintiff was trying to get back up, jumping on the plaintiff's head with a knee was unreasonable. The defendants' position is that Plaintiff's conviction for

resisting arrest may offer a basis to bar Plaintiff's § 1983 claim for a violation of the 4th Amendment during his arrest.

Whether the Plaintiff's State Law Claims Are Barred by the CA Torts Claims Act.

The plaintiff's position is that the Act does not apply. According to California Government Code Section 950.2, the Act only applies to "a cause of action against a public employee or former public employee for injury resulting from an act or omission in the scope of his employment as a public employee." Police Officer Caine acted outside the scope of his employment when he jumped on the plaintiff's head with his knee. "Unconstitutional acts are not within a government agent's express or implied powers because the government has no power to confer on its agent the authority to act unconstitutionally." Golden Day Schools, Inc. v. Pirillo, 118 F.Supp.2d 1037, 1048.

The defendants' position is that all of Plaintiff's state law claims are time barred as Plaintiff failed to comply with the California Tort Claims Act per Government Code § 800 et seq. Plaintiff cannot get around the mandatory claim presentation

requirements via artful arguments. This will be the subject of

1 | 2

a motion to dismiss these state law claims.

3

### 4. Motions

4 5

6

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

All parties anticipate filing motions in limine. The defendants anticipate filing a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim and summary judgment.

# 5. Amendment of Pleadings

After the defendants produce the police report authored by Police Officer Brady, the plaintiff may amend his complaint to include a cause of action for conspiracy to cover up civil rights violations against Police Officers Caine and Brady.

Defendants contend that no further state law claims can be brought as they are barred per Government Code § 800 et seq.

#### 6. Evidence Preservation

The parties mutually agree to preserve all potentially relevant evidence.

#### 7. Disclosures

The parties shall exchange initial disclosures by April 16, 2008.

#### 8. Discovery

No discovery has been taken thus far.

The plaintiff anticipates taking discovery on Police Officer Caine's training, job performance, prior use of force, racial bias, and disciplinary history and the overall department's prior use of force, racial bias, and disciplinary history.

The defendants will take the deposition of the Plaintiff, any percipient witnesses identified in discovery, as well as

propound written discovery on Plaintiff. Other discovery, unknown at this time, may also be necessary.

#### 9. Class Actions

N/A

#### 10. Related Cases

N/A

#### 11. Relief

Plaintiff seeks the following relief in this case:

Damages	Amount
Pain and suffering	\$125,000.00
Emotional distress	\$25,000.00
Medical expenses	\$5,000.00
Civil penalties	\$100,000.00
Punitive damages	\$2,500,000.00

#### 12. Settlement and ADR

The parties have agreed to participate in an ENE (Early Neutral Evaluation) in this matter, which will occur by July 3, 2008. Some discovery needs to occur between the parties prior to the ENE.

## 13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes

The parties consent to Chief Magistrate Judge James Larson only.

## 14. Other References

The case is not suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

# 1

# 15. Narrowing of Issues

2

The parties stipulate to the following facts:

3

1. On November 27, 2006, San Pablo Police Officer Brady made a traffic stop of a vehicle being driven by the plaintiff.

5

2. The plaintiff then fled from Police Officer Brady by car and then later on foot.

6 7

# 16. Expedited Schedule

8

This case cannot be handled on an expedited basis.

9

# 17. Scheduling

10

The parties propose the following schedule in this matter:

11	Event	Proposed Deadline
12	Deadline to add additional	June 16, 2008
13	parties/claims without leave	
14	Deadline to Complete ADR	July 3, 2008
15	Date of Next Case Management	August 27, 2008
16	Conference	
17	Completion of non-expert	November 21, 2008
18	discovery	
19	Expert Disclosure Deadline	December 2, 2008
20	Rebuttal Expert Disclosure	December 16, 2008
21	Deadline	
22	Completion of Expert	January 16, 2009
23	Discovery	
24	Last Day to Hear Dispositive	February 6, 2009
25	motions	
26	File Pre-Trial Conference	March 2, 2009
27	Statements	
28	Pre-Trial Conference (subject	March 9, 2009